



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/224,211	12/30/1998	JACK WASSOM	06975/033001	3985

26171 7590 07/15/2008
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

HUYNH, BA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/224,211	Applicant(s) WASSOM ET AL.	
	Examiner Ba Huynh	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 80-89 and 109-135 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 80-89-109-135 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 80-89, 109-116 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #6,480,852 (Himmel et al), in view of US patent 5,983,270 (Abraham et al)

- As for claims 109, 116, 129: Himmel et al (hereinafter Himmel) teach a computer implemented method and corresponding system for tailoring a user interface favorites (i.e., bookmarks, 5:35-37) menu for a user, comprising the steps/means for providing a first favorites menu related to first content and configured to enable access to the first content by users having a first demographic characteristic (e.g., content rated for children), providing a second favorites menu related to second content different from the first content and configured to enable access to the second content by users having a second demographic characteristic different from the first demographic characteristic (e.g., content rated for adult, 7:27-8:17), receiving an online identifier for a user (9:39-43); accessing a demographic characteristic associated with the user in a database based on the online identifier for the user (9:30-43), based on the demographic associated with the user automatically selecting a selected favorites

menu from among a plurality of favorites menu that include the first and second favorites menu (7:33-47, 9:43-49, fig. 5), automatically making the selected favorites menu perceivable to the user, the selected favorites menu containing a plurality of links, each link selectable to access a particular content item (1:66-2:2, 6:6-8, 9:50-55, 10:17-21, fig. 6), and enabling the user to manually add/remove links to/from the plurality of links in the selected favorites menu for that user (1:66-2:7, 6:33-53), where subsequent perception of the selected favorites menus reveals a menu of favorites that includes added links and excludes removed links. Per Himmel, an adult is allowed to rate a bookmark based on demographic grouping (e.g., Children, Adult. 7:33-47) thus restrict his/her children from accessing rated materials based on the children's password. Thus it appears that the adult must first associate his/her children password with a demographic grouping. Himmel fails to clearly teach the use of screen name (user identifier, group identifier) for authentication. However in the same field of Internet access to websites (Abraham's 11:27-40), Abraham teach the implementation of screen name (group identifier) assigned to group of users according to access level. Each group can be further divided into subgroup and sub-subgroup. Each subgroup and sub-subgroup is associated with a subordinate screen name. Abraham also teaches a master screen for associating a screen name with demographic grouping (10:13-57, figs 8E, 8H, 8I, 8N). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine Abraham's teaching of screen name grouping to Himmel for defining and authorizing access to favorite menu to group of children in the same demographic range. Motivation of the

Art Unit: 2179

combine is for the obvious advantage of allowing access to group of children instead of individual child.

- As for claim 80: The content of bookmarks drop-down menu associated with a first user profile is different to the bookmarks drop-down menu associated with a second user profile (Restricted menu items are not displayed or grayed-out). Himmel is not clear regarding the bookmark menu is a pull down menu. However, Official notice is taken that implementation of Bookmark pull down menu is well known in the art (see previous rejection of claim 80). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known implementation of Bookmark pull down menu to Himmel. Motivation of the combining is for screen estate management.
- As for claim 81: The menus are links to contents from various remote sources (fig. 6).
- As for claim 82: The remote sources include a network service provider (e.g., investor.com, medical.com, IBM. Figure 6).
- As for claim 83: Himmel&Abraham fails to clearly teach that the content includes e-mail. However Official notice is taken that implementation of bookmarking Email is well known in the art (see US 6,487,557, fig 6, and US 2002/0107946, par 0004). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well-known implementation of bookmarking Email to Himmel. Motivation of the implementation is for providing a shortcut to the bookmarked Email.

- As for claim 84: The content includes Internet content (fig. 6).
- As for claim 85: Himmel fails to clearly teach that the content includes chat session. However Official notice is taken that implementation of bookmarking Email is well known in the art (see US 6,832,350, fig 14). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well-known implementation of bookmarking chat session to Himmel. Motivation of the implementation is for providing a shortcut to the bookmarked chat session.
- As for claims 86-88, 110: The demographic characteristic comprises adult and child maturity level of the user (7:26-47).
- As for claim 89: The user favorite menu is automatically generated and presented to the user (fig. 5).
- As for claim 111: The service comprises favorite menu services (Himmel's fig. 6).
- As for claim 112-115: Himmel as combined with Abraham allows a parent to define and authorize to group of children based on age and maturity level such as kid and teenager.
- As for claims 117, 122, 123, 128, 131: In view of Abraham's teaching of subgroup, the combined Himmel&Abraham allows a parent to define and authorize access to different subgroup of children, each having a subordinate screen name.
- As for claims 118, 119, 124, 125, 129-133: In light of the combining, a parent set up an account (sub-account) for a group of child (subgroup) of the same demographic range and assigning the group an associated screen name. The group of children is

authorized limit access to the bookmark via customized bookmark menu, automatically displayed, as defined by the parent.

- As for claims 120, 126, 134: The combined Himmel&Abraham further teaches storing of user identifiers and group identifiers and associated access levels in a table. The group (or subgroup) of children identified by the group identifier are authorized limit access to the bookmark via customized bookmark menu, automatically displayed, as defined by the parent. (Abraham's 16:28-62).
- As for claims 121, 127: In view of Abraham's teaching of subgroup, the combined Himmel&Abraham allows a parent to define and authorize access to different subgroup of children, each having a subordinate screen name identifying a child in the group to others users.
- As for claim 135: The combined Himmel&Abraham fails to clearly teach that the first subordinate screen name comprises a name chosen when the first child is communicating with other users online. However it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to use the existing child's identifier for the subordinate group screen name. Motivation of the combine is for the advantage of the name has been familiar to the child and has been recognized by the others.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However the argument is moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection set forth above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (571) 272-4138. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ba Huynh

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179